

The Westfield-Washington Advisory Plan Commission held a meeting on Tuesday, July 19, 2010 scheduled for 7:00 PM at the Westfield City Hall.

**Opening of Meeting:** 7:00 PM

**Roll Call:** Note Presence of a Quorum

**Commission Members Present:** Dan Degnan, Pete Emigh, Cindy Spoljaric, Bob Spraeetz, Robert Smith, and Steve Hoover.

**City Staff Present:** Matthew Skelton, Director; Jennifer Miller, Senior Planner; Ryan Schafer, Planner; and Brian Zaiger, City Attorney

**Approval of the Minutes:**

Motion to approve minutes of June 21, 2010 and July 6, 2010 as presented.

Motion: Spoljaric; Second: Spraeetz; Vote: Pass by Voice Vote

Miller reviewed the public hearing rules and rules of procedure.

### **OLD BUSINESS**

Case No.	1006-PUD-06
Petitioner	Westfield Enterprises, LLC
Description	2432 East South Street; Petitioner requests a change in zoning of approximately 9.5 acres from AG-SF1 to the Kalorama Park PUD.

Skelton discussed the project and stated that staff proposed several modifications and worked through them with the developer to reach mutual solutions. He stated that staff is recommending approval of the proposal as modified.

Spoljaric stated that it is difficult to envision how this project will all fit with 50% open space and up to 40 units, which is 8 units per acre, with 25-foot lot widths and a 1,500 square foot minimum floor plan.

Skelton referred to the Phase I plan and stated that the intent is not to build 25-foot wide lots, but because of the orientation around open space, there will be some exceptions and that this is more about the concept overall.

Spoljaric asked if there will be fencing on individual lots.

Mr. Jim Anderson responded that each house will be separated from courtyard space in the cottage clusters by a fence.

Spoljaric asked about the timing of the amenity phasing.

Skelton stated that the amenities will be required at the time of each phase construction.

Anderson stated that generally speaking, all the amenities will be constructed at the beginning of the project.

Motion to send 1006-PUD-06 to the City Council with a positive recommendation.

Motion: Hoover; Second: Emigh; Vote: 6-0

Case No.	1007-PUD-07
Petitioner	WLB Associates, Inc.
Description	Northeast Corner of Springmill Road and Spring Lake Drive; Petitioner requests a change in zoning from the SF-A District to the Maples at Springmill PUD District to allow single family detached homes.

Skelton discussed the petition, stating that staff has reviewed the ordinance in detail. He also mentioned the addition of architectural standards. He further stated that the developer has agreed to the proposed changes and staff recommends approval.

Spoljaric asked for clarification regarding the courtyards being included as common space.

Mr. Jon Dobosiewicz stated that the patios and fences on exterior in Phase I are all within common area – the resident only owns the footprint underneath the unit. He further stated that courtyards and exterior improvements would be approved by the association.

Hoover asked if the porches would be located in common area or part of the footprint.

Mr. Wayne Beverage responded that generally speaking when they measure the footprint, they measure only the enclosed space. So, anything outside the footprint is in common area.

Hoovers confirmed that the porch then is also common area under that definition.

Beverage responded that Hoover is correct.

Motion to send 1007-PUD-07 to the City Council with a positive recommendation.

Motion: Degnan; Second: Spraeetz; Vote: 6-0

Case No. 1001-PUD-01  
Petitioner Estridge Development Company  
Description 146<sup>th</sup> Street and Towne Road; Petitioner requests a change in zoning on approximately 1,409 acres from the AG-SF1, SF-2 and Centennial North PUD districts to the Symphony PUD District.

Skelton presented the staff action plan stating that discussion tonight would include the master plan, the consent issues, and public input summary. He further stated that later in the meeting, the petitioner will share the concept for village development.

Degnan suggested that all public comments be kept in one place. He also expressed concern about the date expectations on the action plan.

Hoover stated that he is getting close to completing a first review, and that he has a lot of questions.

Mr. Paul Estridge, Jr. addressed the timeline, stating that the petition was filed December 7, 2009 and this is the fourth draft and offered one or two working meetings to begin the process and answer questions.

Smith asked for agreement from the Commission of the guideline given.

Skelton discussed the consent item, stating that the petitioner is going to withdraw the Laufter property from the proposal. He stated that he believes the other outstanding consent issues can be resolved.

Spoljaric asked if the Commission is allowed to review a PUD that is not under single ownership or control.

Mr. Joe Calderon stated that the Laufter property has been formally withdrawn from the proposal. He further stated that there is a similar situation with 129 acres owned by Carriger & Caito, who authorized the petitioner to proceed until such time that business issues can or cannot be resolved. Calderon stated that last Friday, Carriger & Caito formally requested that Estridge make a formal proposal for the property. He further stated that this property does not need to be withdrawn at this time and hopefully by the next meeting, the petitioner will have formal consent.

Skelton discussed the public input summary stating that the consistency of comments received were in regards to: the Ditch Road and 146<sup>th</sup> Street commercial area; the impact on property values, including light, noise, aesthetics, and buffering/transitions; holding true to terms in zoning conditions or commitments; the alignment of Towne Road; how the exception piece will be buffered (Laufter property), if the market will support this project; what will happen to our market; and is this viable in the marketplace.

Estridge responded to the public input issues stating that the YMCA has been moved to the corner of Ditch Road and 146<sup>th</sup> Street. He further stated that the pond(s) in that area of Symphony and the pond in Centennial South will be connected to create one large pond. He further added that the tree line will be preserved between residents and the YMCA soccer/baseball fields. He stated that at the next meeting, the petitioner will have a detailed design of exact types of buffers. Regarding lighting, he stated that the City's standards are being met with a few requested exceptions. He further stated that lighting has been eliminated on the golf/driving range. Estridge addressed the viability of proposed commercial areas, stating that one of the reasons they believe the commercial is very viable is because of what 146<sup>th</sup> Street will become in the future. He also discussed traffic counts.

Estridge further addressed some miscellaneous items. He stated that the amenities will not be combined with Centennial but there will be two separate HOA's. He further stated, with regard to service provider choices, that all service providers will be asked to provide higher levels of technology, including fiber to the home, noting that this will be open to anyone who wants to meet the technological standards.

Estridge stated that the proposed interceptor sewer will eliminate the lift station at 156<sup>th</sup> Street and Towne Road. He stated that the Towne Road realignment will need more discussion. He addressed the cost to the public stating that the cost to the community will be zero because Symphony pays for the cost of infrastructure from fees (i.e. developer fees, builder fees, etc). He also stated that no new schools will be required based on conversations with the school corporation. He added that they are meeting the City's standards regarding drainage.

He addressed village platting, stating that the petitioner is proposing a different platting process whereby each section of each village would be platted on a village by village basis.

Hoover asked if the petitioner's summary could be forwarded to the Commission members.

Spoljaric stated that moving forward, it would be helpful to have information ahead of time in order to be prepared.

Skelton encouraged the Commission to get their questions to staff as they come up so that staff can have plenty of time to research and address them.

### **BZA LIAISON COMMENTS**

Degnan discussed a recent BZA case where a gun shop placed next to a school was allowable, although the variance of use request for an indoor range was denied by the Board. This item raised his awareness of what the zoning ordinance might allow, and he felt this may be something that may need to be addressed in the future.

**COMMISSIONER COMMENTS**

Spoljaric asked for update on Grand Junction Zoning Ordinance.

Skelton responded that staff met with the consultant last week and is putting finishing touches on it. He further stated that it will probably be presented to the Grand Junction Task Group first, then brought forward to Plan Commission later.

**ADJOURNMENT** (8:30 p.m.)

Approved (date)

---

President, Robert Smith, Esq.

---

Vice President, Cindy Spoljaric

---

Secretary, Matthew S. Skelton, Esq., AICP